

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY
Commerce and Administration Faculty Council

MINUTES OF MEETING
Friday, April 6, 1984

In attendance: S. Appelbaum (Chairman)

Bryan Barbieri (Mkt.), Cleve Patterson (Fin.), Joe Kelly (Mana.), Peter Wade (Acco.), J.M. Corvington (DIA/DSA), S.K. Goyal (Q.M.), R. McTavish (Q.M.), R. Wills (Assoc. Dean), Ray Martin (Reg.), F.L. Sbrocchi (Acco.), Muriel Armstrong (Econ.), Christopher Ross (Mkt.), Michel Laroche (Mkt.), Lizanne Winser (MBA), V. Kirpalani (Mkt.), D.F. MacDonald (Acco.), L.J. Boyle (Asst. Dean), Brian Hawker (Office of Dean), S.A. Alvi (Econ.), Diana Maharaj (Lib.), Alan Hochstein (Fin.), David Lloyd (CGSA), Lyne Fortin (CGSA), Peter E. Pitsiladis (Asso. Dean), Charles Draimin (Asst. Dean), Dale Dorren (Q.M.), Gary Johns (Mana.), Carl Sandblom (Q.M.), Jack Goodwin (Mana.), Calvin Potter (Fin.), George Semine (CSA), Dennis Lee (CSA), Kamal Argheyd (Mana.), Basil Bereza (CSS).

I. Call to Order

The Meeting was called to order at 09:30 a.m.

II. Closed Meeting

There were no items on the Agenda for a closed meeting.

III. Open Meeting

IV. Approval of Agenda (CAFC-84-03A)

It was moved by Prof. MacDonald that the Agenda (CAFC-84-03/A) be approved.

Seconded by Professor Kirpalani

CARRIED

V. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting (CAFC-84-02M)

Professor P. Pitsiladis made the following corrections:

- i) page 2 (Item VI), paragraph 2, line 2 to read as follows:
that the Board did have, from time to time, projects and questions which...
- ii) page 2 (Item IX), paragraph 2, line 4: delete the word program.
page 2 (Item IX), paragraph 2, line 5: change the word Council to read Graduate Studies Committeee.

Professor Laroche pointed out that his name had been omitted from those in attendance.

It was then moved by Professor Laroche that the Minutes of the Previous Meeting (CAFC-84-02M) be approved as amended.

Seconded by Professor Wills

CARRIED

VI. Chairman's Remarks

The Chairman informed Council that he would not be making any comments at this time and that his remarks would be made during the discussion of the remaining items on the Agenda.

VII. Question Period

There were no questions raised.

VIII. Business Arising From Previous Meeting

1. Discussion of Faculty of Commerce & Administration Mission Statement

Professor Kelly informed Council that he had prepared a video tape of some of the field work his committee had been doing, which would be shown to Council members. He then proposed that the document re Mission Statement submitted to Council be adopted in principle and that any necessary changes could be incorporated into the document later. He pointed out that his proposal was based on the fact that the document had been submitted to the Council members only a few days earlier and that, consequently, Council members may not have had sufficient time to study the document in depth.

Before making his summary report, Professor Kelly thanked the committee for their diligent work. He pointed out that the committee had gone to all the departments and programs and had obtained their inputs. He then summarized the salient points of the report as follows:

The first part, the Preamble, constituted in effect the Faculty's Charter, which was then followed by its Primary Mission. Under a subsequent heading, the report referred to the distance between the Faculty and its principal client, the business community. Other sections of the report dealt with the departments' involvement in such programs as the Executive MBA and the M.Sc. in Management. "Future Staffing Developments" made the distinction between the departments growing merely in size and the creation of centers of excellence. "Liaison with Business" indicated that much, if not all, of the current functions of the CCMS would be performed by the Faculty itself. Under "International Exchange", it was apparent that the Faculty would have to develop different organizational patterns to cope with all the activities that were being planned. The report also pointed to the inevitability of some organizational differences occurring in this area.

Professor Kelly ended his report by saying that implicit in the report was the point that each faculty member would, in fact, have to prepare a personal mission statement, which the Dean's Office would then use to prepare the final version of the Faculty's Mission Statement. In conclusion, Professor Kelly stated that if the current stage of the Faculty's Mission Statement (the second year it was being deliberated) could be viewed as that of diagnosis, the third year would then be the research stage with the fourth being that of evaluation. He then moved that the Faculty's Mission Statement, as presented in the document under discussion, be accepted in principle.

Seconded by Professor Kirpalani.

In the ensuing discussion, several Council members voiced their concern regarding the lack of time that had been available to study the document. A few members indicated that, if the motion were to be put to a vote, they would have to abstain since, in their opinion, the document was too significant to be dealt with, without a prior thorough reading. It was then suggested that instead of accepting the document in principle, it be received by Council and be then fully discussed at the Council meeting of May 18, 1984.

In the light of the foregoing discussion, Professor Kelly amended his motion as follows:

Council has received the report of the Faculty Mission Committee and will discuss the said report at its meeting of May 18, 1984.

Seconded by Professor Kirpalani

CARRIED

IX. Reports from Standing Committees

1. Commerce Graduate Studies Committee

Professor Pitsiladis reported that the Committee had received the proposals concerning the Executive M.B.A. and had referred them to the M.B.A. Committee. The latter has submitted its report to Faculty Council to be discussed as a separate item on the Agenda. Next, Professor Pitsiladis informed Council that the revised academic regulations for the M.B.A. program were currently being distributed to all departments so that they could be discussed at the next Council meeting.

2. Commerce Undergraduate Curriculum Report

Professor R. Wills, referring to document CAFC-84-03A-03, moved that the changes recommended in the said document be approved, as proposed by the committee.

Seconded by Professor MacDonald.

CARRIED

Regarding document CAFC 84-03A-04 first, Professor Wills gave a brief background summary. Next, Professor Doreen explained that the document constituted a clean-up and update in the curriculum reflecting changes in the field and that the Q.M. Department had consulted many people in the business community to this effect. He then highlighted the principal changes proposed in the document. Professor Wills then moved that the changes recommended in document CAFC 84-03A-04 be approved.

Seconded by Professor Armstrong.

During the ensuing discussion, several members stated that they had received the document rather late and had not thus had sufficient time to study it. It was also pointed out that the documents had been given only to Council members and not to the whole faculty. Professor Dhawan then requested of the Chairman that all faculty members receive copies of such documents.

Professor Wills pointed out that it was the duty of department representatives on Council to keep their respective departments well informed on such matters. He further stated that if the proposed changes were to be incorporated in the curriculum for September 1985, they would have to be approved this very month. Finally, he said that most of the document dealt with Q.M. courses except where it addressed itself to ACCO 414. He therefore proposed that ACCO 414 be removed from the document and that the discussion then proceed.

Professor Barbieri requested further explanation regarding item 6 of QM 221. Professor Doreen explained that an increasing number of students had a basic understanding of computers, but required more

information regarding the basic applications of computers in business.

Professor Wade asked whether any rationalization had been made between the courses offered by Computer Sciences and those offered by the QM Department, so as to avoid duplication as well as gaps. Professor Farhoomand replied that the QM Department's focus was more on information systems and data processing and less on technical aspects. He further stated that QM 221 was changed almost every year to keep up with the rapid changes and developments in the field and that the QM Department was already working on the changes for 1985. Professor Sandblom added that the number of courses in the QM Department had doubled and expressed his concern regarding the department's ability to keep up with this increase.

Professor McTavish explained that the QM Department had gone through its own mission statement exercise. Information Processing and Operations Management were very important topics and his department had addressed this issue. Regarding Professor Wade's concern, Professor McTavish expressed his hope that the faculty would soon be offering a Ph.D. in this area. He confirmed the need to move in this direction and to train more people in this area. He concluded by saying that his department was indeed concerned about these issues and was therefore showing leadership in this respect by recommending the changes under discussion.

Professor Wills then amended his motion by proposing that all QM changes recommended in CAFC-84-03A-04 be approved.

Seconded by Professor Goyal.

For: 17

Opposed: 2

Abstentions: 10
(including Professors Barbieri and Sandblom)

CARRIED

Professor Wills then moved that the recommendations set forth in CAFC-84-034-05 be approved in principle.

Seconded by Professor Ross.

In reply to the renewed objection that the document was received late thus not leaving sufficient time for its perusal, the Chairman commented that the proposal had been received late last fall and wondered why no comments had been forthcoming sooner. Professor Wills explained that some discussion had already taken place, but that the document was offering additional details. In reply to a question from Professor Johns regarding the difference between the major and the minor in the program, Professor Wills stated that the issue was explained on pages 5 and 8 of the document.

Professor Barbieri then proposed that the motion be amended as follows:

Council approves the recommendation set forth in CAFC-84-034-05 regarding a Major in International Business as well as the number of credits, but not the name nor the contents of the courses.

The original mover and seconder of the motion accepted the amendment and the motion was put to a vote.

For: 19

Opposed: 1

Abstention: 8

CARRIED

Professor Kelly then suggested that the faculty members proposing such motions ought to make sure that such changes are explained to the faculty prior to bringing the documents to Council for approval. The Chairman concurred with this suggestion and urged the "movers" of such changes to communicate their proposals to all departments and obtain the latters' feedback before submitting the motion to Faculty Council.

The next document for discussion was CAFC-84-03A-02, which, according to Professor Wills, met all the requirements discussed earlier. Professor Wills stated that there had been numerous meetings and extensive dialogues with students and other interested parties. He then summarized the committee's findings as follows:

There was general agreement that Entrepreneurship and Small Business should not be offered as separate courses, but incorporated in existing ones such as Mana 460; the International Business not be in the core, but also incorporated in the existing courses; that Operations Management should cover applications and not just techniques.

Regarding computer literacy, everyone agreed that it was needed. Attempts were being made to introduce the topic in high schools and CEGEPs, but few students currently entering the university had adequate computer literacy. Therefore, a course such as QM211 was mandatory. In addition, all other courses should endeavor to make more use of computer applications.

Business Communication was also very much needed, but not as a separate course in the core. Instead, this topic was to be incorporated in all the existing courses. A recommendation to this effect had been sent to all departments and the committee was awaiting the departments' feedback.

Regarding the Conceptual Foundations of Business, most departments had expressed their concern regarding the absence of a course outline for this subject. Professor Wills then went on to give further explanation regarding the various models outlined in the document and concluded by saying that he was not making a formal motion at this time, but would answer any questions that Council members might have.

In reply to a question regarding the degree of liberalization recommended in the document, Professor Wills explained that students in CEGEPs were discouraged from any specialization. However, the business community was not so much concerned with courses offered outside the Commerce Faculty, but more with the relevance of Commerce's own courses. He went on to say that in Accountancy, Concordia's core curriculum was consistent with other U.S. and Canadian universities, but that other departments wanted to intensify their core offerings. He then reported that both students and alumni had complained about the lack of rigor in our courses and that the general feeling was that our students did not know how to work hard. Consequently, he said, departments would have to redesign their core offerings in order to incorporate the committee's recommendations contained in the document under discussion. Professor Wills then moved that Council accept in principle Model 1A outlined in document CAFC-84-3A-02.

Seconded by Professor Armstrong.

Professor Alvi agreed in favor of more liberalization and said that by relaxing core requirements the faculty would be offering greater opportunities to students. Instead the faculty seemed to be making its core stricter and more rigid. Professor Wills replied that Queens University had also strengthened its core. Furthermore, he explained, Concordia with its three-year program, did not have the same flexibility vis-à-vis liberalization as other universities with four-year programs. He also reported that many B.Admin. students were dissatisfied with the program, in which 30 credits were obtainable outside the Commerce faculty. The market was, he said, highly competitive and required a greater degree of specialization. However, he pointed out, the issue of the B. Admin. was not dealt with in the report since the program had many more options open to it.

Professor Pitsiladis asked why Business Communication and Conceptual Foundations of Business were included in the curriculum if, as reported, there was not much support for them. Professor Wills replied that the departments had supported these courses, but had requested additional information regarding the contents of such courses. It seemed that the faculty did not consider itself very knowledgeable about Business Communication, whereas regarding the Conceptual Foundations of Business, the faculty felt that Business Policy covered the issue.

Professor Goodwin wanted to know how strong the committee's preference was for Model 1A. He also remarked that the committee's recommendation seemed more like the reshuffling of an old deck of cards without any new changes. He went on to say that he saw little point in further reshuffling until such time as the Mission Statement was finalized. Professor Wills replied that the recommendations indeed constituted a reshuffling. He cited the business community as asking the faculty to give students the basic tools, thus enabling the business community to complete the students'

education. In light of the above, the committee had decided to retain the original format but recommend changes in course content.

Professor Johns stated that if Business Communication was such an important issue, it merited a separate course and should not be introduced by osmosis into the other courses. He disagreed however, with Conceptual Foundations of Business being offered as a separate course.

Professor Sandblom remarked that Operations Management was not an area in which there was general agreement. It was sad to see, he said, that such issues were decided by people who proclaimed themselves to be authorities, but who, in fact, had little knowledge of the subject. He admitted that his was perhaps a minority point of view, but there was, in his opinion, a significant disagreement regarding this issue in his department.

Professor Alvi pointed out that the committee's proposal effectively ruled out any Honors programs in B.Comm. and Economics. He stated that until 1976, seventy percent of their students on the SGW campus were from Commerce, whereas this figure was currently close to ten percent. He attributed this drop to the absence of an Honors program in Economics within the Commerce faculty.

Professor Wills replied that an Honors program in Economics did exist, but not within the Commerce faculty. Furthermore, while the report had not addressed itself to the issue of Majors and Minors in Economics, he felt certain that the question could be reconsidered and appropriate accommodations could also be made.

Professor Ross, commenting on the Conceptual Foundations of Business, said that he favored such a course. He explained that one of the major criticisms of business schools was that their graduates did not have any sense of history. The remedy for this shortcoming was to get the students to take a look at philosophy and how business functioned. Students needed a global sense of the functional areas as well as the relationship of business with government, society, ethics, etc. and its fit with the total system - and Business Policy could not by itself satisfy these needs.

Professor Kelly stated that the faculty needed to understand the implications of the specific proposal under discussion. He said that the current program had been very successful because it had been thought out in a very structured way. He pointed out that under the current proposal the Management Department would end up with eighteen credits. He then suggested that students be allowed to vote through their preferences regarding the courses they wanted to enrol in. He also said that the faculty could not allow courses to go through without a firm knowledge of their actual content or as to how they were going to be taught. He went on to say that Management had much overlap in their courses and the syllabi had therefore to be hammered out in such a way as to avoid repetition.

He then suggested that Council advise the Curriculum Committee regarding the number of credits to be included in the core and then let the committee do its exercise.

Mr. Semine presented the students' point of view as follows: Regarding the issue of liberalization, it was not clear what the word meant. Therefore, it was assumed that the program would be more diversified. Regarding computer literacy, it was felt that by the time another course was added, the whole issue would have become outdated. It was therefore imperative to move fast by adding a computer course as well as integrating more applications of management tools into all courses instead of offering more theories. Business Communication was considered as an extremely important issue and that students strongly advocated the adoption of such a course. He said that he had already submitted some recommendations to Professor Wills, along the lines of the approach of the University of Western Ontario, for developing students' skills in both written and oral communication. Students wanted to know how to write a report effectively and how to make a presentation.

Regarding the Conceptual Foundations of Business, as outlined in Model 1C, students did not want another rhetorical course similar to those offered in CEGEPs. They wanted, instead, to learn how to apply various concepts to business. Mr. Semine concluded by saying that the program should be made more rigorous. Some courses were offered too late in the program, while others like Acco 218 were too rigorous. A change to the better was needed, he said, and soon.

Professor Draimin pointed out that Council was getting into too much detail and that the preparation of course content was not the business of Faculty Council. Professor Wills replied that the rationale for proposing an acceptance in principle was so that details could then be worked out by the committee and reported back to Council.

Professor Pitsiladis supported Professor Wills and said that if Council were to approve the motion, the committee would then have its work cut out regarding course content and pedagogy. He pointed out that this was the first step in a very long journey and that the motion was, therefore, useful in getting the faculty to move forward.

Professor Barbieri suggested that instead of dealing with the number of credits, a better approach would be to proceed with the Zero Based Budget principle, i.e. justifying each and every course. He also proposed to ask the specialists in Business Communication to advise the committee on this issue. As for the Conceptual Foundation of Business, he felt it was a useful course since it would help students become better business persons as opposed to just majoring in functional areas.

Professor Potter commented that liberalization did not mean liberal arts. It meant taking concepts that had values in the business world and applying them to business. Liberalization meant more deregulation of the program by allowing a greater choice and more freedom of choice. It was therefore essential to decide how much choice and freedom the faculty wanted to allow.

Professor Doreen pointed out that the committee had already delineated the critical areas. Regarding Business Communication, the faculty did not have a very clear idea of what this was. Nor was there anything available at the moment as such a choice in any of the departments. He then suggested that offering courses under 495 might be an appropriate start. Furthermore, no department, except one, had submitted any substantial changes in their core courses.

Professor Ross then inquired about the control procedures regarding Business Communication and Conceptual Foundations of Business if these courses were not included in the core. Professor MacDonald suggested the addition of a phrase to the motion indicating that the total of 54 credits was not binding. The Chairman then suggested to include a range of credits for the core, say 48 to 54.

Professor Wills then amended his motion to read:
Council approves, in principle, the recommendations as outlined in Model 1, CAFC-84-03A-02 with the proviso that the number of credits in the core would range between 48 and 54.

Seconded by Professor Draimin.

For: 16
Opposed: 10
Abstentions: 4

Professor Wills then pointed out that this approval was only the first stage of the curriculum revision process and, that in the next, the committee would review all feedback and report back to Council.

The Chairman informed Council that Professor David MacDonald had completed twenty years of service and offered his congratulations. He also expressed his delight at seeing Professor Potter back from his illness and thanked him for his monumental work in the recent hearings.

X. Reports From Faculty Representatives on University Committees

1. University Senate

Nothing to report.

2. Graduate Programs

a) MBA:

Nothing to report.

b) DIA/DSA:

Mr. Corvington reported that the current objective was to improve quality and to increase the general awareness regarding these programs. The quality of the program was in the process of being upgraded. As for creating a greater awareness, the programs were being advertised in Trade Journals. He said that he was also working with the Ph.D. Visiting Speakers Workshop in inviting people to attend; the response to date had been positive.

c) Diploma in Accountancy:

Nothing to report.

d) Ph.D. Program:

Professor Draimin informed Council that there were currently twenty Ph.D. applicants and that their files were being circulated among the faculty. He also informed Council that Ms. Helen Deresky would be defending her thesis on April 17, 1984. In reply to Professor Kelly's request regarding the possibility of postponing the date, Professor Draimin replied that the date had been set by the Division of Graduate Studies and that it was not within the Faculty's power to stop or change it. He then said any member of the University could read her thesis and submit questions in writing to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Finally, he announced that the Working Papers had been printed and distributed.

3. University Curriculum Coordinating Committee

Nothing to report.

4. Computer Science Committee

Nothing to report.

5. Commerce Representative on Arts & Science Faculty Council

Nothing to Report.

6. Library Committee

Nothing to Report.

7. C.A.S.A.

Nothing to Report

8. Visiting Speakers Committee

Nothing to report.

XI. New Business

1. Executive M.B.A.

Professor Draimin stated that the program had been proposed two years ago and that extensive discussions had taken place since; an open meeting had also been held on this question recently. GSC had finally approved the program and therefore, continued Professor Draimin, he was making the motion that the basic structure of the Executive M.B.A. program, as approved by GSC, be adopted by Council.

Seconded by Professor Johns.

In the ensuing discussion, Professor Potter questioned the reporting procedure and suggested that it be amended so that the Program Director would be reporting to the committee instead of to the Dean. Professor Draimin assured him that in academic matters the reporting procedures for the Executive MBA would be identical to those of all other graduate programs in the Faculty. Professor Kelly commented first on the admission standards and said that these should be relaxed. For instance the cut off of the GMAT score should be lowered and special group criteria should also be developed for those being admitted to the program. Regarding the feasibility of the program, Professor Kelly suggested that the Dean should put someone in temporary charge of the program who, along with a dozen faculty members, would spend some time visiting various companies to collect the names of prospective and potential candidates. The Chairman replied that the administration was already in the process of collecting these names.

Professor Draimin commented that the objective was for the candidates of this program to have higher qualifications than regular M.B.A. applicants. Professor Sbrocchi added that the entire process of admission would be a highly personal one. Professor Pitsiladis remarked that nothing in the document was incompatible with Professor Kelly's comments and that, in fact, no one set of criteria precluded others.

Professor Potter, referring to the provincial funding, asked that if the program were to be self-funded, would it not be then drawing candidates away from the regular M.B.A. Program? The Chairman explained that the intention was not to be dependent on the government and that, consequently, it would not be causing any conflicts or resource drains.

In reply to Professor Barbieri's question regarding whether the regular M.B.A. would thus become a glorified B.Comm., the Chairman explained that the principal difference between the two programs would be in content and in the selection of people teaching in

them. Professor Pitsiladis pointed out that the document's covering letter of transmittal explained many of the non-academic issues, but he agreed that further assessment of the market was needed.

The motion was then put to a vote.

For: 20
Opposed: 1
Abstention: 1

XII. Other Business

Ms. Fortin reminded Council that the M.B.A. annual dinner was being held that evening at the Ritz-Carleton Hotel and expressed her hope to see as many faculty members as possible.

XIII. Adjournment

Professor Wills moved that the meeting be adjourned.

Seconded by Professor Goodwin.

CARRIED

XIV. Next Meeting

The next meeting of Faculty Council will be held on Friday, May 18, 1984, 09:30, Room GM 504 (SGW Campus).